

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1, 6 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse and note that the steps cannot be performed mentally or verbally or without a machine since, among other things, a rendering of drawing packets must be performed. However, in order to expedite prosecution, and not for purposes of patentability, Applicants have amended the method claims to note that the method for object base visibility is performed by an apparatus that performs graphics processing. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duluk, Jr. et al. in view of Bishop et al. Claim 1 has been canceled and new claim 21 has been added. Also, Applicants have amended independent claims to indicate that the method includes, inter alia, receiving a plurality of draw packets associated with a high resolution geometric representation of a specific object and comparing each of the plurality of draw packets to a bounding volume object, wherein the bounding volume object is a low resolution geometric representation of the specific object and then rendering one or more draw packets deemed potentially visible based on the comparison of the packets for the high resolution object to that of the low resolution representation of the object. The geometric representation of the specific object is a low resolution model of the specific object that is rendered prior to a detailed model of the specific object. (See for example, paragraph 0015 and elsewhere).

The cited portion of the reference does not teach such a multi-pass visibility culling operation that employs a low resolution object visibility query to determine drawing packets that are deemed potentially visible as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

In addition, claim 20 requires that a plurality of visibility query identifiers define which of a plurality of hardware queries are to be updated across multiple driver contexts. (See for example, paragraph 0022 and elsewhere). A plurality of visibility query IDs do not appear to be taught or suggested by the cited portions of the reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance as well.

Claims 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duluk in view of Bishop, and further in view of Migdal et al. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above and as such, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 21, 2009

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
phone: (312) 609-7599  
fax: (312) 609-5005